

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-3 remain in the application. No new matter has been added. Consideration and examination is respectfully requested.

### **1. REGARDING ALLOWABILITY OF CLAIMS 1 & 2:**

Regarding the Parent Application (Serial Number 09/970,550) as amended, in item 2 on page 2 of Paper 4 dated 10 March 2003, it was alleged that *Klas et al.* in U.S. Patent 5,432,484 entitled "Connector for Communication Systems with Cancelled Crosstalk", hereinafter *Klas* anticipated claims 11 and 13 (among others). In other communications addressing the originally filed application, Applicant respectfully traversed those rejections.

Claims 11 and 13 of the original application as amended correspond in part to claims 1 and 2 of the Present Application.

As stated in MPEP 2131 "To anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim." As will be shown in the following paragraphs, *Klas* fails to teach every element of claims 1-2 of the Present Application.

Among other items, *Klas* does not teach the adjustment of the "length and width of a portion of the signal path at which a parasitic element is present ... both before and after the parasitic element" as in claim 1 of the Present Application. *Klas* teaches ONLY the adjustment of signal path properties in ONE location, i.e., section B of Figure 1. Thus, claim 1 is not anticipated by *Klas*, and claim 1 is therefore allowable.

As claim 2 depends from claim 1, it is noted that claim 2 has all the features described above for claim 1 as elements. As such, claim 2 is not anticipated by *Klas*.

It follows from the above remarks that claim 2 is also allowable.

### **2. REGARDING ALLOWABILITY OF CLAIM 3:**

Regarding the Parent Application as amended, in item 4 on page 3 of Paper 4, it was alleged that claim 14, was unpatentable over *Klas* in view of Jain et al. in U.S. Patent 6,133,805 entitled "Isolation in Multi-Layer Structures", hereinafter *Jain*. In other communications addressing the originally filed application, Applicant respectfully traversed

that rejection.

Claim 14 of the original application as amended corresponds in part to claim 3 of the Present Application.

Referring to MPEP 2142, "To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations."

As demonstrated above, *Klas* does not teach the adjustment of the "length and width of a portion of the signal path at which a parasitic element is present ... before and after the parasitic element" as in claim 1 of the Present Application. *Klas* teaches ONLY the adjustment of signal path properties in ONE location, i.e., section B of Figure 1. Also, *Jain* does not teach this claim limitation of claim 1. As claim 3 depends from claim 1, it is noted that claim 3 has all the features described above for claim 1 as elements.

Thus, the prior art references when combined do not teach nor do they suggest all the claim limitations of claim 3 as required by MPEP 2142. As such, claim 3 is not obvious over *Klas* in view of *Jain*, and it follows that claim 3 is allowable.

### **3. REGARDING ALLOWABILITY OF CLAIM 4:**

Regarding the parent application, in item 5 on page 3 of Paper 4 dated 10 March 2003, claim 16 was objected to as "being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims". Applicant respectively traverses the objection. However, to overcome the objection of Paper 4, claim 16 of the Parent Application has been rewritten as claim 4 of the Present Application so as to include the limitations of base claim 11, as well as intervening claims 12 and 15 of the Parent Application as written prior to the Amendment filed 10 June 2003. Thus, Applicant has overcome the rejection of Paper 4, and claim 16 is allowable.

### 3. IN CONCLUSION:

Applicant believes that all claims pending in this Patent Application are allowable. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to grant an early allowance to this Application.

Respectfully submitted,

by Morley C. Tobey, Jr.

Morley C. Tobey, Jr.

Reg. No. 43,955

October 30, 2003

Loveland, CO 80537

(970) 669-1266